

USAWC STRATEGY RESEARCH PROJECT

DEFEATING ANTI-AMERICANISM

by

Lieutenant Colonel Mark T. McKenzie
United States Air Force

Colonel Christine Stark
Project Advisor

This SRP is submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the Master of Strategic Studies Degree. The U.S. Army War College is accredited by the Commission on Higher Education of the Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools, 3624 Market Street, Philadelphia, PA 19104, (215) 662-5606. The Commission on Higher Education is an institutional accrediting agency recognized by the U.S. Secretary of Education and the Council for Higher Education Accreditation.

The views expressed in this student academic research paper are those of the author and do not reflect the official policy or position of the Department of the Army, Department of Defense, or the U.S. Government.

U.S. Army War College
CARLISLE BARRACKS, PENNSYLVANIA 17013

Report Documentation Page

*Form Approved
OMB No. 0704-0188*

Public reporting burden for the collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to a penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number.

1. REPORT DATE 18 MAR 2005	2. REPORT TYPE	3. DATES COVERED -		
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE Defeating Anti-Americanism		5a. CONTRACT NUMBER		
		5b. GRANT NUMBER		
		5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER		
6. AUTHOR(S) Mark McKenzie		5d. PROJECT NUMBER		
		5e. TASK NUMBER		
		5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER		
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) U.S. Army War College,Carlisle Barracks,Carlisle,PA,17013-5050		8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER		
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)		10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)		
		11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)		
12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for public release; distribution unlimited				
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES				
14. ABSTRACT See attached.				
15. SUBJECT TERMS				
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:		17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT	18. NUMBER OF PAGES 22	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON
a. REPORT unclassified	b. ABSTRACT unclassified			

ABSTRACT

AUTHOR: Lt. Colonel Mark T. McKenzie
TITLE: Defeating Anti-Americanism
FORMAT: Strategy Research Project
DATE: 18 March 2005 PAGES: 22 CLASSIFICATION: Unclassified

The United States of America has enjoyed unrivaled success militarily and economically over the past two decades. This success comes at a cost for Americans as growing international criticisms of U.S. policy and anti-Americanism increases dramatically from other countries around the globe. In addition to this criticism during this time of unrivaled power, America has seen a drastic increase in attacks against its citizens in foreign countries, such as the Marine barracks bombing in Beirut, the Khobar tower attack, and the attack on the USS Cole. While terrorist attacks within the U.S. have been limited in nature comparatively, the attacks of September 11, 2001, have reawakened U.S. citizens to the inherent dangers of today's global environment, and the effects of anti-Americanism.

Current U.S. policy is best stated by President Bush in the 2002 National Security Strategy: "Freedom is the non-negotiable demand of human dignity, the birthright of every person-in every civilization." Does this policy of globalization increase or decrease anti-American sentiments at home and abroad? This research paper will study the history of anti-Americanism, its causes, and current policies, and offer recommendations to defeat anti-Americanism and limit its adverse effects.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	iii
DEFEATING ANTI-AMERICANISM.....	1
HISTORY OF ANTI-AMERICANISM.....	1
THE BUSH DOCTRINE.....	4
AMERICAN IDEALS.....	6
WAR AGAINST ANTI-AMERICANISM.....	6
DIPLOMACY.....	7
EDUCATION.....	8
STRATEGIC COMMUNICATION.....	9
ROLE OF THE MILITARY.....	10
CONCLUSION	11
ENDNOTES	13
BIBLIOGRAPHY	15

DEFEATING ANTI-AMERICANISM

In January 2001 President George W. Bush delivered, what was considered at that time, an unremarkable inaugural address. He stated "While many of our citizens prosper, others doubt the promise, even the justice of our country." Current U.S. policy is best stated by President Bush in the 2002 National Security Strategy: "Today, the United States enjoys a position of unparalleled military strength and great economic and political influence. In keeping with our heritage and principles, we do not use our strength to press for unilateral advantage. We seek instead to create a balance of power that favors human freedom: conditions in which all nations and all societies can choose for themselves the rewards and challenges of political and economic liberty."¹

Arguably the world's sole remaining military superpower, the United States is viewed by some as an imperialist nation. The term imperialism suggests oppression rather than freedom. And, it is this concept of oppression that appears to be a major contributing factor to anti-Americanism. This, despite a recent statement by President Bush, "we do not use our strength to press for unilateral advantage, instead we seek to create a balance of power that favors human freedom; conditions in which all nations and all societies can choose for themselves the rewards and challenges of political and economic liberty.² Terrorist's abroad have begun targeting Americans and what they stand for, and also target fledgling democracies as seen by recent attacks against election workers in Iraq, suicide bombers at Iraqi polling stations and death threats against Iraqi and Afghani citizens who vote.

HISTORY OF ANTI-AMERICANISM

Anti-Americanism is an age old concept predating the United States itself. This sentiment has evolved through time, yet remains remarkably consistent. Two recurring themes of anti-Americanism are, that the United States is an immoral society that threatens to become a world model, and that the United States is a nation seeking to dominate the world.

An early example of anti-Americanism came from a French lawyer, Simon Linguet, in the 1780s. "The dregs of Europe", he warned, "would build a dreadful society in America, create a strong army, take over Europe, and destroy civilization. If one were to be talking about the spread of notions like democracy and liberty, Linguet's fear was something of a personal premonition. A few years later, he was guillotined during the French revolution.

Similarly, the first use of the word "Americanization" has been traced to an 1867 article in a French journal which warned that the import of American agricultural machinery would end with the elimination of French culture. It is no accident that France has long been the global capital of anti-Americanism. Indeed, the level of

hatred toward the United States in the 1920s and 1930s, as well as other decades, has been arguably higher than today.³

American policy throughout its history has leaned toward isolationism. This was disrupted when the United States chose to enter WWI in 1917. The balance of power swung in the allies favor due in part to the U.S. military might and the benefits of its significant industrial base. Following the defeat of Germany in WWI, the U.S. withdrew into isolationism once again and began enjoying the relative prosperity of the roaring 20's, while hoping to remain clear of any future violence or entanglements of European conflicts. The U.S. remained a country unto itself until the dramatic events of December 7, 1941, when it was drawn into WWII by the attack on Pearl Harbor.

American involvement in WWII was absolutely crucial in the fight against fascism, and a period of goodwill towards the U.S. ensued, as illustrated by a Swedish historian.

"I was born in Stockholm in 1939, just before the outbreak of WWII. Remember that Sweden has now lived in peace for almost 200 years. We happened to be spared by both Hitler and Stalin. Not because we defended ourselves – we did not, we were "neutral" – but because others did the job for us. Who are those "others"? Those others are the soldiers from the United States of America. They protected us first from Nazism and later from Soviet Communism. The US saved us from slavery, torture and terror and from being forced to live on the totalitarian planet. Thank you, America! Thank you for your idealism, your strength, your military, your leaders and your dedication to democracy, not only for your own country but for hundreds of millions of people in a large number of other nations, not least Israel. Thank you, America!"⁴

WWII became a major turning point for world order as U.S. influence dramatically increased globally, while European influence waned. The resulting goodwill did not last long as America's involvement in the Korean War renewed anti-American feelings.

"There's a long history of anti-Americanism in South Korea, dating back to the end of World War II," noted historian James Matray. "During the period since the Korean War, anti-Americanism has been steadily growing." There is a perception among many South Koreans that the United States continually supported dictators ruling South Korea during the 1960s, '70s and '80s. Matray also said many South Koreans believe the 37,000 American forces still based on the peninsula are a barrier to reunification with the North. In the 1980s, South Korean demonstrations prompted the establishment of a new constitution that allowed for the popular election of a president. With that, the government began lifting limitations on free speech. South Koreans were free to openly express anti-American sentiment. President Bush's "Axis of Evil" speech did nothing to improve relations. Matray called the speech a "clear milestone" in events prompting increased anti-American sentiment.⁵

The 40 year Cold War between the United States and Soviet Union was another war of ideals. This war pitted U.S. democracy, against Soviet communism. "In Paul Holland's book,

Anti-Americanism, Rational and Irrational, he argues that anti-Americanism is not the dilemma that critics would have us believe:

A strong argument against the concern of Anti-Americanism would be the virtual collapse of communism. The crisis of communist systems that not only stimulated anti-Americanism by their official propaganda, but some of which were seen by social critics in the west as possible counter models or alternatives to capitalist systems such as the United States. The dramatic disintegration of communist systems by itself reduced the volume of Anti-Americanism as these states used to target the United States.⁶

The next major conflict involving U.S. forces abroad was Southeast Asia. The Vietnam War was a low point in terms of international opinion for the United States in general, and the U.S. military in particular. In the early 90s, journalist Richard Bernstein wrote: "The Vietnam War ended with the most powerful episode of self doubt, of questioning America's role in the world that the country has ever experienced. That self doubt, the ambivalence about America's nature, remains a part of the collective heritage even now...many who came of age during the 1960s have never regained the confidence in the essential goodness of America and the American Government that prevailed in earlier periods."⁷ This feeling pervaded throughout the country and as the war became more unpopular, so did America's standing in world opinion for many years to come.

In 1992, U.S. involvement in Iraq during Operation Desert Storm, was seen by many as the antithesis of the Vietnam War and worked to stir favorable public opinion nationally and internationally. The U.S. military success in Iraq was a boon to the American psyche, and the U.S. military standing in world opinion. As noted by Paul Holland in his book on anti-Americanism:

The war with Iraq was seen by many as signaling the end of the Vietnam syndrome: isolationism, hostility toward the military establishment, and the collective self doubt. While clearly the quick and successful war with Iraq did lead to an upsurge in national pride and sympathy towards the military forces, a new peace movement promptly emerged and once more became a voice of intense social criticism.

For many peace activist the Gulf War appeared to provide new and welcome vindication of a set of feelings that had been much in evidence during the Vietnam War and during the years when the U.S. supported the anticommunist guerillas in Nicaragua. As with its predecessors, the latest peace movement attracted a large corps of individuals fully convinced of the systemic defects of the United States and deeply disturbed by any assertion of its Military power.⁸

Throughout America's history, time and distance have contributed to America's sense of isolation, but our culture also plays a large role in the "sense in which America is a world unto

itself".⁹ As America learned so harshly on 9/11/01, it can no longer count on isolation as a defense mechanism. More importantly in today's global environment, the United States of America and its citizens cannot afford economically, to be an isolationist nation.

In remarks by President Bush to the Graduating class at West Point in May 2002, he stated: "Our nation's cause has always been larger than our nation's defense. We fight, as we always fight, for a just peace -- a peace that favors human liberty. We will defend the peace against threats from terrorists and tyrants. We will preserve the peace by building good relations among the great powers. And we will extend the peace by encouraging free and open societies on every continent. Building this just peace is America's opportunity, and America's duty. From this day forward, it is your challenge, as well, and we will meet this challenge together. You will wear the uniform of a great and unique country. America has no empire to extend or utopia to establish. We wish for others only what we wish for ourselves -- safety from violence, the rewards of liberty, and the hope for a better life."¹⁰

It has been widely noted that foreigners do not dislike Americans, they like the people, products, and media, but do not favor U.S. "policy". Non U.S. citizens view Americans through the lens created by the media, and that lens has recently focused on a U.S. President that at times comes across as a "cowboy". U.S. political analysis and policy perspectives are seldom the focus of the media. Reasoning and rational as opposed to rhetoric and sound bites should be represented by the media to offer a balanced perspective to the world audience. President Bush states: "The U.S. national security strategy will be based on a distinctly American internationalism that reflects the union of our values and our national interests. The aim of this strategy is to help make the world not just safer but better. Our goals on the path to progress are clear: political and economic freedom, peaceful relations with other states, and respect for human dignity."¹¹

THE BUSH DOCTRINE

On 12 September, 2001, in his speech to the American people, President Bush stated what would later be referred to as The Bush Doctrine: "We will make no distinction between those who planned these attacks, and those who harbor them." This statement was further defined during his speech at West Point:

The U.S. has an historic opportunity to preserve peace, where great powers compete in peace instead of preparing for war. Competition between great nations is inevitable, but armed conflict is not. Civilized nations find ourselves united by common dangers. America has and intends to keep, military beyond challenge, limiting rivalries to trade and other pursuits of peace. Great powers are increasingly united by common values sharing a deep commitment to human

freedom. Nations will discover that economic freedom is the lasting source of national wealth, and that social and political freedom is the only true source of national greatness. America cannot impose this vision, but can support and reward governments that make the right choices for their own people through developmental aid, diplomatic efforts, international broadcasting and educational aid.¹²

This doctrine reflects the realities of U.S. hegemony and will shape U.S. policy for decades to come, in conjunction with the aspirations of American political principles. To this point, Thomas Donnelly asks:

Does the Bush Doctrine represent a new course for American policy or simply an elaborate justification for the administration's actions? If nothing else, the Bush Doctrine, articulated by the president over the past eighteen months in a series of speeches and encapsulated in the new National Security Strategy, represents a reversal of course from Clinton-era policies in regard to the uses of U.S. power and, especially, military force. So perhaps it is no surprise that many Americans--and others in the rest of the world as well--are struggling to keep up with the changes. Indeed, it often appears that many in the administration cannot keep up with the president. But in fact the Bush Doctrine represents a return to the first principles of American security strategy. The Bush Doctrine also represents the realities of international politics in the post-cold-war, sole-superpower world. Further, the combination of these two factors--America's universal political principles and unprecedented global power and influence--make the Bush Doctrine a whole greater than the sum of its parts; it is likely to remain the basis for U.S. security strategy for decades to come.¹³

According to critics, the Bush doctrine remains an integral aspect of the current state of anti-Americanism, as others perceive a global power with no peer that appears to do as it pleases. Thus it is important to note that in the Overview of America's International Strategy, the President's vision of America's role and responsibility is:

The United States possesses unprecedented-and unequalled-strength and influence in the world. Sustained by faith in the principles of liberty, and the value of a free society, this position comes with unparalleled responsibilities, obligations, and opportunity. The great strength of this nation must be used to promote a balance of power that favors freedom.

As the world's sole remaining military superpower, President Bush has made the decision that the U.S. is bound to correct global injustice, through military action when necessary. There remain limits to U.S. power, and not all corrupt regimes can be changed, but President Bush made the decision to respond in Afghanistan and Iraq for a multitude of reasons, believing that democracy in the Middle East would promote a more secure global environment. Differences in culture, especially in the Middle East, make this one of the most misunderstood aspects of U.S. foreign diplomacy. We must do better as a nation communicating with others, our intentions and motives, and convince critics that America's only ulterior motive is the security and well-

being of its people. President Bush stated: "America's experience as a great multi-ethnic democracy affirms our conviction that people of many heritages and faiths can live and prosper in peace."¹⁴ The message that must remain a pillar of American diplomacy is one of liberty, freedom, and democracy.

AMERICAN IDEALS

In the book Anti-Americanism, Jean Francois Revel states

America's popular culture, skillfully advertised, reaches the entire world via the new high-tech media, and American tastes--in dress, music, recreation and fast food--attract young people everywhere. American movies and television shows draw audiences of millions, so much so that some countries seek to establish protectionist barriers in the name of "cultural exceptionalism." English has become the defacto language of the internet and has for a long time been the international language of science. A sizable portion of the political, technological and scientific elites throughout the world have graduated from American Universities.¹⁵

U.S. culture is the most imitated throughout the world, and as Revel further notes: "Likewise American-style federalist democracy is increasingly being imitated, starting with the European Union; it serves as the organizing principle of international alliances such as NATO and the United Nations."¹⁶

In the book, "Why do People Hate America" the authors point to a poll taken post September 11th that revealed 58% of non-U.S. respondents felt that Washington's policies were a major cause in fueling resentment and anger against the United States.¹⁷ It would appear as though people across the globe don't hate Americans and their culture, and those things American, but instead dislike its policies.

WAR AGAINST ANTI-AMERICANISM

In the war against Anti-Americanism, U.S. strategic objectives must include: decreasing animosity towards the U. S. and its allies, strengthening diplomatic ties throughout the world, and decreasing the threat and opportunity for terrorism from radical fundamentalist.

The strategic concepts to meet these objectives must include all elements of national power, to include but not limited to: increased diplomatic relations, increased education programs, humanitarian assistance, military to military contacts, and economic programs fostering trade and economic growth. Leveraging these components to further goodwill and fostering a deeper understanding of the U.S. and its policies is paramount to this effort. The strategic means to accomplish these objectives include diplomatic efforts to decrease animosity towards America, education at home and abroad, and all forms of communication and media to

help foster an appreciation of American ideals, values, and the benefits of living in a culture born from diversity.

The threat of anti-Americanism and maintaining the status quo creates a hazardous security environment for all citizens both domestically and internationally. This national interest of defeating anti-Americanism lies not only with the security of our population, but expands to include the increased economic benefits associated with an increase in legitimate trade partners. The advisory group on public diplomacy noted in their recent submission to congress, "the objective of foreign policy is to promote our national interests and while not, specifically, to inspire affection, hostility toward the U.S. makes achieving our policy goals far more difficult".¹⁸

Challenges in the Middle East are made more difficult because religion is involved, and national values are not always congruent. The advisory group on diplomacy further states "We must underscore the common ground in both our values and policies. We have failed to listen and failed to understand our audience, and we have not bothered to help them understand us."¹⁹ The benefits of increasing cultural understanding through education, diplomacy, and more successful informational campaigns are limitless. Strategic changes must target both U.S. and international audiences in order to ensure success.

DIPLOMACY

Today, the State Department spends approximately \$600 million on public diplomacy programs worldwide, and the Broadcasting Board of Governors spends another \$540 million. In addition, the Middle East Partnership Initiative proposes to spend \$100 million to expand economic, political, and educational opportunity and empower women in these areas. For comparative analysis these monetary figures combined represent three-tenths of 1 percent of the annual Defense Department budget.²⁰

In terms of resources dedicated to diplomacy, both people and capitol, the amount dedicated to the Middle East is woefully inadequate. Using an Isolationist attitude served America in the past, as feelings of ill will towards America were not truly felt within our borders. This all changed on September 11th. Obviously, maintaining the status quo is not working.

A key challenge the United States faces in the Middle East is identification of common ground in both values and policies. The advisory group on public diplomacy notes:

Surveys show that Arabs and Muslims admire the universal values for which the United States stands. They admire, as well, our technology, entrepreneurial zeal, and the achievements of Americans as individuals. We were told many times in our travels in Arab countries that "we like Americans but not what the American government is doing". This distinction is unrealistic, since Americans elect their

government and broadly support its foreign policy, but the assertion that “we like you but don’t like your policies” offers hope for transformed public diplomacy.²¹

According to this report to Congress, the apparatus of public diplomacy continues to be inadequate. The system is outmoded, lacks strategic direction, resources, and there is an absurdly dangerous under-funding of public diplomacy efforts.

Some of the recommendations in The Report to the Advisory Group on Public Diplomacy for the Arab and Muslim World include the following:

A cabinet level counselor in charge of strategic direction and inter-agency coordination of public diplomacy; more testing and research of diplomatic programs prior to fielding, and that programs be continually measured for effectiveness; adequate resources and funding; additional professional staff dedicated to issues of Arab and Muslim world; increased use of communication technologies; expansion of scope of American corners Program; and lastly launch new initiative called the American Knowledge Library, where thousands of the best American books are translated and made available to American Studies Centers, Universities, and American Corners throughout the world.²²

The advisory group makes an effective argument for diplomacy as a means to combat anti-Americanism. It is clear that more funding and personnel are needed to counter the massive cutbacks diplomacy budgets experienced in the late 1980s, and the resulting negative impact. Creating additional cabinet level positions is not the answer, and would only further dilute Secretary of States’ vision on these issues. The advisory group’s recommendation for an American Knowledge Library is a widely accepted initiative, as education remains one of the best tools in this effort.

EDUCATION

A key principle to defeat anti-Americanism is education both within and outside the borders of American soil. Over the past century, leaders from many nations have sent their best and brightest to the United States for education. Lawrence Summers, the president of Harvard and a former US Treasury Secretary, wrote a letter to former Secretary of State Colin Powell, and stated: “If the next generation of foreign leaders decides to pursue their foreign education elsewhere, we will have lost the incalculable benefits derived from their extended exposure to our country and its democratic values.”²³ This is so important because the U.S., in the war against anti-Americanism, cannot allow others to define its interests and values.

It is important for foreign elites to come to the U.S. for education. It is equally, if not more important to increase educational opportunities for the less fortunate of other countries. Federal funding of scholarships and monetary incentives for U.S. universities to encourage this participation should be of paramount interest to the U.S. government.

One final educational consideration is increased presence of U.S. students in foreign universities. These students are U.S. ambassadors abroad, and while their views are not always aligned with current administrative policies, it is the human element that remains most powerful in winning over the hearts of friends and allies. This diversity and expression of opinion is an aspect of our nation that has allowed it to endure and prosper.

If education is the key, then communication is the tool to help achieve this goal. In today's global environment, with instantaneous reporting of news and information, it is crucial that all media and tools of communication be utilized to encourage a broader understanding of American interests and values.

STRATEGIC COMMUNICATION

In early 2004, the Defense Science Board Summer Study on the Transition to and from Hostilities was formed. Within this group was a sub task force dealing specifically with strategic communication issues, re-examining the purpose of strategic communication.

Some of the issues considered were the consequences of changes in the strategic communications environment, public diplomacy and open military information operations, and the degree of executive level (presidential) oversight. It was the conclusion of the task force that U.S. Strategic Communication must be transformed as America's negative image in world opinion has diminished its ability to persuade and influence world affairs positively.

Strategic Communication is a vital component of U.S. national security. It is in crisis, and it must be transformed with a strength of purpose that matches our commitment to diplomacy, defense, intelligence, law enforcement, and homeland security. Presidential leadership and the bipartisan political will of Congress are essential. Collaboration between government and the private sector on an unprecedented scale is imperative. To succeed, we must understand the United States is engaged in a generational and global struggle about ideas, not a war between the West and Islam. It is more than a war against the tactic of terrorism. We must think in terms of global networks, both government and non-government. If we continue to concentrate primarily on states, we will fail.²⁴

One issue noted by the task force was the importance of building distance between the private and public sector, utilizing "credible messengers with non-government resumes, creative thinkers and talented communicators uncomfortable working with government agencies, and skilled, language qualified professionals available for temporary crisis deployment."²⁵ This would ensure a high quality product, and also negate the appearance of propaganda, and impropriety. "The complexity of strategic communication problems calls for balanced coordination of effort. Independent analysis is required in a wide range of fields: cultures and values, international intellectual engagement, communications studies, and applied science."²⁶

The task force concluded: "Given the enormous challenges we face, we can succeed only if we use all the instruments of national power. We should expect to see some progress within a year but we are dealing with at least a decade to have a significant impact."²⁷

One of the main challenges that the U.S. faces in trying to get a balanced story to the international community are the distortions and inaccuracies used by critics of U.S. policy, unfriendly states, and radical fundamentalist propaganda, through outlets such as Al Jazeera.

According to Fouad Ajami, in an article for the New York Times Magazine:

Al-Jazeera's reporters are adept at riling up the viewer. A fiercely opinionated group, most are either pan-Arabists—nationalists of a leftist bent committed to the idea of a single nation across the many frontiers of the Arab world—or Islamists who draw their inspiration from the primacy of the Muslim faith in political life. Since their primary allegiance is to fellow Muslims, not Muslim states, Al-Jazeera's reporters and editors have no qualms about challenging the wisdom of today's Arab rulers.²⁸

The Ajami article uses many examples to indicate the anti-American slant of Al Jazeera, and while not every aspect of its coverage is violently anti-American, "Al Jazeera's virulent anti-American bias undercuts all its virtues. It is, in the final analysis, a dangerous force. And it should be treated as such by Washington."²⁹ Countering this information produced and disseminated by Al Jazeera and like organizations or co-opting their efforts should remain the focus of U.S. efforts in this area.

ROLE OF THE MILITARY

The military's role in diplomacy cannot be overlooked. The U.S. military is respected throughout the world for its professionalism, skillfulness and dedication. The U.S. soldier in uniform is synonymous with the American flag, and remains today one of the most highly recognizable aspects of the country. The recent success of the democratic process in troubled areas is in no small part due to the assistance of the U.S. military. According to Freedom House, a non profit organization founded by Eleanor Roosevelt:

Over the last 15 years, the number of electoral democracies has risen from 69 out of 167 (41 percent) to 119 out of 192 (62 percent). On average during that time frame, an additional 3 states have adopted minimal standards for free and fair elections each year. Of the world's 192 states, 119 are electoral democracies (89 Free and 30 Partly Free), an increase of 2 since 2003. While these states are not all rated Free, all provide considerable political space and media access for opposition movements and allow for elections that meet minimum international standards of ballot secrecy and vote tabulation³⁰

With decisive military action and operations in Afghanistan and Iraq, and the continued improvements of the democratic process in both countries, it is clear that the best course of

action to defeat anti-Americanism is a combination of education diplomacy, and communicative networking efforts. The United States must place a much greater emphasis on diplomacy in the Middle East, and this translates into an increase in funding and personnel for diplomacy as requested by the advisory group on public diplomacy. Increased funding for information operations is also necessary, but the U.S. must not be seen as propagandist. Every opportunity must be taken to explain American ideals and values.

The U.S. military is an important presence in the Middle East, and our allies in the area yearn for increased contacts and inter-operability. Not only are increased military to military contacts necessary, there must be more coalition exercises that involve these nations of vital interest. Military exchange tours are woefully inadequate with our Middle Eastern allies, and also must be increased. During Operation Iraqi Freedom a senior leader of the Royal Saudi Arabian Air Force stated that it was his hope that the United States would return after the war for joint exercises with the Saudi Arabian Air Force.

Challenges that remain in the war against anti-Americanism stem from the difficulty in fighting a war of ideas. New York Times journalist Thomas Friedman states:

Unlike the Soviet Union, the Islamist terrorists are neither a state subject to conventional deterrence or international rules, nor individuals deterred by the fear of death. And their home societies, in too many cases, have not stigmatized their acts as shameful. In too many cases their spiritual leaders have provided them with religious cover, and their local charities have provided them with money...We cannot change other societies and cultures on our own...What we can do is partner with the forces of moderation within these societies to help fight the war of ideas. Because ultimately this is a struggle within the Arab-Muslim world, and we have to help our allies there, just as we did in World Wars I and II.³¹

CONCLUSION

In the war against anti-Americanism, U.S. National Security objectives must include marked increase of efforts in diplomacy, education and strategic communication to decrease foreign animosity towards the U.S. and its allies. As President Bush noted in his second inaugural address, "In these four years, Americans have seen the unfolding of large events. We have known times of sorrow, and hours of uncertainty, and days of victory. In all this history, even when we have disagreed, we have seen threads of purpose that unite us. The attack on freedom in our world has reaffirmed our confidence in freedom's power to change the world. We are all part of a great venture: To extend the promise of freedom in our country, to renew the values that sustain our liberty, and to spread the peace that freedom brings."

In February 2005 in his second inaugural address, President Bush defines his argument for democracy as follows:

We are led, by events and common sense, to one conclusion: The survival of liberty in our land increasingly depends on the success of liberty in other lands. The best hope for peace in our world is the expansion of freedom in all the world.

America's vital interests and our deepest beliefs are now one. From the day of our founding, we have proclaimed that every man and woman on this earth has rights and dignity and matchless value because they bear the image of the maker of heaven and earth. Across the generations, we have proclaimed the imperative of self-government, because no one is fit to be a master, and no one deserves to be a slave.

Advancing these ideals is the mission that created our nation. It is the honorable achievement of our fathers. Now it is the urgent requirement of our nation's security, and the calling of our time. So it is the policy of the United States to seek and support the growth of democratic movements and institutions in every nation and culture, with the ultimate goal of ending tyranny in our world.³²

The strategic concepts to meet the objectives outlined in this paper must leverage all elements of national power, to include but not limited to: increased diplomatic relations, increased education programs, humanitarian assistance, military to military contacts, and economic programs fostering trade and economic growth. Leveraging these components to further goodwill and foster a deeper understanding of the U.S. and its policies is paramount in the effort to defeat anti-Americanism. Democracy remains the strongest deterrence against the radical fundamentalist anti-Americans, who are willing to use any and all means to defeat American ideals. Therefore the U.S. must continue its support of democratization in these troubled areas, using diplomacy, information operations, economic reform and finally the military to further democracy, and assist nations in their quest for liberty. To ignore this problem and return to isolationism is not an option. There is only one answer and it lies in education and an increase in American efforts focused on the propagation of freedom.

WORD COUNT=5380

ENDNOTES

¹ George W. Bush, *The National Security Strategy for the United States of America* (Washington, D.C.: The White House, September 2002), ii.

² Ibid.

³ Barry Rubin, "Understanding Anti-Americanism," 20 August 2004; available from <<http://www.fpri.org/enotes/20040820.west.rubinb.antiamericanism.html>>; Internet; accessed 14 December 2004.

⁴ Per Ahlmark, "Anti-Semitism and Anti-Americanism: Dangerous Links," 27 October 2004; available from <http://www.ncsj.org/AuxPages/102704GFAA_Ahlmark.shtml>; Internet; accessed 22 December 2004.

⁵ James Matray, "Revisiting Korea: Exposing Myths of the Forgotten War," 9 February 2001, available from <<http://www.trumanlibrary.org/korea/matray1.htm#matray>>; accessed 22 December 2004.

⁶ Paul Holland, *Anti-Americanism: Irrational & Rational* (London: Oxford University Press, Inc, 1992), lxxix.

⁷ Richard Bernstein, "Long Conflict Deeply Marked Self Image of Americans." (*New York Times*, 2 February 1992), quoted in Paul Holland, *Anti-Americanism: Irrational & Rational*, (London: Oxford University Press, Inc, 1992), lxxx.

⁸ Holland, lxxx.

⁹ Richard Crockatt, *America Embattled, September 11, Anti-Americanism and the Global Order*, (London: Routledge, 2003), 15.

¹⁰ George W. Bush, Prepared speech at 2002 Graduation Exercise of the United States Military Academy, West Point, New York, 30 May 2002.

¹¹ George W. Bush, *The National Security Strategy for the United States of America* (Washington, D.C.: The White House, September 2002), 2.

¹² Ibid.

¹³ Thomas Donnelly, "The Underpinnings of the Bush Doctrine," 31 January 2003; available from <http://www.aei.org/publications/pubID.15845/pub_detail.asp>; Internet; accessed 2 January 2005.

¹⁴ George W. Bush, *The National Security Strategy for the United States of America* (Washington, D.C.: The White House, September 2002), 3.

¹⁵ Jean Francois Revel, *Anti Americanism*, (San Francisco California: Encounter Books, 2003), 16.

¹⁶ Ibid., 16.

¹⁷ Ziauddin Sardar and Merryl Wyn Davies, *Why do People Hate America*, (New York: The Disinformation Company Ltd, 2002), 10.

¹⁸ Advisory Group on Public Diplomacy for the Arab and Muslim World, *Changing Minds Winning Peace: A New Strategic Direction for U.S. Public Diplomacy in the Arab & Muslim World, Report to Congress* (Washington, D.C., October, 2003) 19.

¹⁹ Ibid., 24.

²⁰ Ibid., 25.

²¹ Ibid., 24.

²² Ibid., 25.

²³ James Bone, "Visa crackdown costs US cream of foreign students," 29 November 2004; available from <<http://www.timesonline.co.uk/article/0,,3561-1380322,00.html>>; Internet; accessed 6 January 2005.

²⁴ Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, "Report of the Defense Science Board Task Force on Strategic Communication," September 2004; available from <http://www.acq.osd.mil/dsb/reports/2004-09-Strategic_Communication.pdf>; Internet; accessed 4 January 2005.

²⁵ Ibid, p. 5.

²⁶ Ibid, p. 5.

²⁷ Ibid. p. 5.

²⁸ Fouad Ajami, "What the Muslim World is Watching," 18 November 2001; available from <<http://www.allied-media.com/ARABTV/aljazeera/NYtimes%20article.htm>>; Internet; accessed 4 January 2005.

²⁹ Ibid.

³⁰ Michael Goldfarb, "Russia downgraded to not free," 20 December 2004; available from <<http://www.freedomhouse.org/media/pressrel/122004.htm>>; Internet; accessed 6 January 2005.

³¹ Thomas L. Friedman, "War of Ideas," *New York Times*, 8 January 2004, sec. A , p. 33.

³² George W. Bush, "Inaugural Address," 20 January 2005; available from <<http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2005/01/20050120-1.html>>; Internet; accessed 23 January 2005.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ahlmark, Per. "Anti-Semitism and Anti-Americanism: Dangerous Links." 27 October 2004. Available from <http://www.ncsj.org/AuxPages/102704GFAA_Ahlmark.shtml>. Internet. Accessed 22 December 2004.
- Ajami, Fouad. "What the Muslim World is Watching." 18 November 2001. Available from <<http://www.allied-media.com/ARABTV/aljazeera/NYtimes%20article.htm>>. Internet. Accessed 4 January 2005.
- Bernstein, Richard. "Long Conflict Deeply Marked Self Image of Americans." *New York Times*, 2 February 1992. Quoted in Paul Holland, *Anti-Americanism: Irrational & Rational*, lxxx. London: Oxford University Press, Inc, 1992.
- Bone, James. "Visa crackdown costs US cream of foreign students." 29 November 2004. Available from <<http://www.timesonline.co.uk/article/0,,3561-1380322,00.html>>. Internet. Accessed 6 January 2005.
- Bush, George W. *The National Security Strategy for the United States of America*. Washington, D.C.: The White House, September 2002.
- Bush, George W. Prepared speech at 2002 Graduation Exercise of the United States Military Academy. West Point, New York, 30 May 2002.
- Crockatt, Richard. *America Embattled, September 11, Anti-Americanism and the Global Order*. London: Routledge, 2003.
- Donnelly, Thomas. "The Underpinnings of the Bush Doctrine." 31 January 2003. Available from <http://www.aei.org/publications/pubID.15845/pub_detail.asp>. Internet. Accessed 2 January 2005.
- Friedman, Thomas L. "War of Ideas," *New York Times*, 8 January 2004, sec. A , p. 33.
- Goldfarb, Michael. "Russia downgraded to not free." 20 December 2004. Available from <<http://www.freedomhouse.org/media/pressrel/122004.htm>>. Internet. Accessed 6 January 2005.
- Holland, Paul. *Anti-Americanism: Irrational & Rational*. London: Oxford University Press, Inc, 1992.
- Matray, James. "Revisiting Korea: Exposing Myths of the Forgotten War." 9 February 2001. Available from <<http://www.trumanlibrary.org/korea/matray1.htm#matray>>. Internet. Accessed 22 December 2004.
- Revel, Jean Francois. *Anti Americanism*. San Francisco, California: Encounter Books, 2003.
- Rubin, Barry. "Understanding Anti-Americanism." 20 August 2004. Available from <<http://www.fpri.org/enotes/20040820.west.rubinb.antiamericanism.html>>. Internet. Accessed 14 December 2004.

Sardar, Ziauddin and Meryl Wyn Davies, *Why do People Hate America*. New York: The Disinformation Company Ltd, 2002.

U.S. Advisory Group on Public Diplomacy for the Arab and Muslim World, *Changing Minds Winning Peace: A New Strategic Direction for U.S. Public Diplomacy in the Arab & Muslim World, Report to Congress*, Washington, D.C. October, 2003.

U.S. Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, *Report of the Defense Science Board Task Force on Strategic Communication*. September 2004. Available from <http://www.acq.osd.mil/dsb/reports/2004-09-Strategic_Communication.pdf>. Internet. Accessed 4 January 2005.